



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO *CIL*

BY B. L. ULLMAN

Vaticanus-Ottobonianus 1550 is a paper MS of the fifteenth century, containing Catullus, Propertius and a poem by Panormita. On fols. 99*v* and 100*v* are copies of fourteen ancient and two mediaeval inscriptions by a sixteenth-century hand. Twelve of the fourteen ancient inscriptions are published in the *Corpus*, ten in Vol. VI and two in Vol. XI. For only four of the twelve have the editors of the *Corpus* used this MS—all four follow each other in order in the MS. Three of the four are still extant. The other eight published inscriptions are known from other sources, though none are extant. Our MS is valuable in deciding the proper readings in a number of cases. Two inscriptions have, as far as I know, never been published. It is evident that through some strange chance the *Corpus* editor who examined the Vatican MS did not copy all the inscriptions he found there, or else that some of his notes were lost.

The inscriptions are carefully written in capitals, and the place of finding is indicated in short notes. The first inscription was started on fol. 99*v*, but abandoned in the middle of the second line and rewritten on fol. 100*v*, because there was not room enough on fol. 99*v* to preserve the long second line of the inscription intact. This fact, as well as other details, shows that the verse division is meant to be that of the originals. It is apparent that an attempt was made to preserve the interpunctuation, but since there are many evident mistakes I have not recorded it. The two mediaeval inscriptions follow the abandoned inscription on fol. 99*v*. All the others are on fol. 100*v*. All the inscriptions are by the same hand, but the ink of Nos. 11 to 14 is different, and the writing is less careful. They were, no doubt, added later.

I number the inscriptions in the order in which they seem to have been written. I give in each case the place of finding, and such other facts as appear of interest. The *Corpus* used our MS for Nos. 1, 5, 6 and 7.

1. *C. VI. 1936. in quodam limite antiquo quod est super portam inclaustri Sancti Alexii de urbe in monte Auentino.* The *Corpus* cites this MS but does not give its readings. The only difference from the printed text is FVIATORIBVS in line 2. The third line is made of equal length with the second. No difference in size of the letters is indicated.
2. *C. VI. 23716. Epitaphium ante portam Sancte Marie in quirito in Monte Auentino in quo notatur quod .i. ponitur pro .l. et .t. ut in proculus et item etc. quod uel incuria carpentarii uel difficultatis caussa.* I restore thus, following our MS, except as noted below:

D · M
 PACVVIAE · SPERATAE · VXORI
 M · VLPPI · AVG · LIB · ARGAEI
 QVAE · VIX · CVM EO · ANN · XXXVII
 5 FECERVNT
 PACVVI · DVO · HYGIA · ET · PROCVLVS
 MATRI · PIENTISSIMAE · ITEM · SIBI · ET
 LIBERIS · SVIS · LIBERTIS · LIBERTABVSQ
 POSTERISQ · EORVM

4 XXVII.—6 DVOIHYGIA EL.—7 IEM.

3. *C. VI. 17830. In ecclesia Sanctorum quatuor Coronatorum.* I restore thus, following our MS, except as noted:

D · M · S
 FELICLAE · FILIAE
 D V L C I S S I M A E
 QVAE · VIXIT
 5 ANNIS · DVOBVS
 MENSIBVS · III · DIE · I
 SYRIARCHES · ET
 FELICISSIMA · PA
 RENTES · BEN · MER
 10 FELICLA · SIT · TIBI · TERRA · LEVIS

2 FELICIAE.—10 FELICIA.

The readings II in vs. 5 and D· in vs. 6, which the *Corpus* editor prints in his text, opposed as they are to the two¹ authorities cited by him as well as to the new authority now presented, are quite arbitrary. One wonders whether this volume of the

¹ Perhaps three, if Iacobonius (*C. VI, Add.*, p. 3521) is independent.

Corpus is perhaps marred by more high-handed text criticism of the same sort.

4. C. VI. 21757. The description of the place of finding of No. 3, from the position it occupies, is meant to apply also to No. 4. Variants: 2 LIB *omissa littera* L.—5 POSTERISQ.—7 INTER IIII · INAGR · P · IIII ·
- 5, 6, 7. C. VI. 8580, 12772, 1714 respectively. *haec tria <epita>phia sunt <in> ecclesia S<anctae> Mariae ad<busta> gallica in <Regione> Montium.* (I have supplied the letters in the brackets; they are not visible because of the tight binding.) The *Corpus* cites this MS for the three, all of which are extant. The following variants are not noted in the *Corpus*:

8580: 5 PHENIX.—8 FROTINVS.

1714: 4 OLYBRIVC.—11 RVFVS · SVP.

8. See below.
9. C. VI. 20226. *In ecclesia Sancti Eusebii Regionis Montium.* The verse division is as printed in the *Corpus*, except that the last two words occupy separate lines and are indented. Variants: 2 PRIMIIIVO.—4 XnX.
10. C. VI. 21703. The description of the finding-place of No. 9 is meant to apply also to No. 10. The verse division is the same as in the *Corpus*, except that the last two lines are in one. Variants: 2 LVSCIA · EZONI.
11. C. XI. 3336 (VI. 706*) *in oppido blede apud portam.* No difference in the size of the letters is indicated in the MS. Tall *I* is indicated in every case in lines 1–5 except the first *I* of *Germanici* and the *I* of *Ti*. The first *I* of *Culmilius* (vs. 7) is also tall. I suggest C · L · FVSCVS as the proper reading in vs. 7. Variants: 3 N *om.*—AVGS.—7 CIEFVSCVLVS *et in margine litteris minusculis* al's cleusculus.—10 POLLIVS.
12. C. XI. 3338. *in eodem oppido.* The reading IIII VIRO which our MS has in vs. 3 seems preferable to IIII VIR of the *Corpus*.
13. See just below.
14. C. VI. 391. *vers. 1 om.* The inscription was started twice and left unfinished both times. The first time a rectangular frame was made for it, and the last line was written in this. But the line was too long for the frame, and so another start was made. A frame, divided horizontally into two halves, was made, and the last three lines of the inscription were placed in the lower half. This again seemed unsatisfactory, and a diagonal deleting line was drawn through the whole. A third attempt was not made. To show the unfinished character of the copy, it may be noted that the finding-place is not given.

I now give the two unpublished inscriptions:

13. *In vinea ð paluzellis in monte Coelio prope S. Mariam in domnica.*

SILVANO
SACRVM
DONATVS
CAES · N̄ · SER
5 OFICINATOR
D · D ·

8. *hoc epitaphiolum inueni in nostra uinea apud colosseum in uia merulana.*

L · AVRELIO VERO ·
G · ARM · MEDIC · PART ·
MAX · COS · III
OLL SALVTARIS NOMENCLA
5 D M

This is a mate to *C. VI. 1013*, which is thus given in the *Corpus*:

imp. caes. m. AVRELIO ANTONINO
aug. arm ENIACO · MEDICO
parthico MAXIMO · COS · III a. 165-171
· · · · · VS · LIB · CVRATOR
5 *collegii* SALVTARIS
· · · · · ATORVM · S · P · D · D

The following note is appended:

Cognomen *salutaris* videtur indicare funeraticium esse collegium.

The two inscriptions help to restore each other thus:

imp. caes. m. AVRELIO ANTONINO
aug. arm ENIACO · MEDICO
parthico MAXIMO · COS · III
· · · · · aVG · LIB · CVRATOR
5 *collegii* SALVTARIS
nomencl ATORVM · S · P · D · D

imp. caes. L · AVRELIO VERO
auG · ARM · MEDIC · PART
MAX · COS · III
· · · · · *aug. l. cur.* OLL · SALVTARIS NOMENCLA
5 *torum* s. p. D · D

These inscriptions give us a college hitherto unknown, the *collegium salutare nomenclatorum*.¹ It is obvious that they belong together, for they are set up to coemperors by the curator of a college mentioned nowhere else. We have a right, then, to assign them to the same date. The one to Aurelius can be dated 166 or later (Pauly-Wissowa *Realencyclopädie* I, p. 2294), the other, between 167 and 169 (*ibid.* III, p. 1851). The date of both, then, is 167-69.

The place of finding of the two inscriptions also justifies us in putting them together. C. VI. 1013 was found in 1731 in the Villa Casali on the Caelian,² where the present Ospedale Militare is situated (cf., e. g., Lanciani *Forma* 36), the other, in a vineyard in the Via Merulana near the Colosseum. The old Via Merulana must be meant, as the present street of that name was not built until 1575,³ and we shall see that the inscriptions were copied in our MS before that date. The vineyard was perhaps just west of the present Ospedale di San Giovanni, where the ancient Via Merulana ended, that is, practically on the same site as the later Villa Casali.

A still closer connection may have existed between the two inscriptions. It will be noticed that both are incomplete on the left. About the same amount is missing in each. One is tempted to explain this state of affairs by supposing that both inscriptions were inscribed on one base, one above the other. The one to Aurelius would naturally be the upper one. Confirmation of this supposition is found in the fact that the inscription to Verus seems compressed. Apparently the stonecutter, after writing AVG in the second line, saw that he did not have room for as many lines as he had in the first inscription, and decided to save space by abbreviating, and also, in the first paroxysm of economy,

¹This *collegium* belongs in *Liste G, A, a* in Waltzing's classification (*Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains* IV, pp. 154 ff.), as well as in *Liste L, collegia salutaria*. It is to be compared, e. g., with the *collegium praegustatorium*, C. VI. 9004 (Waltzing, p. 158).

²C. VI, p. 842.

³Lanciani *Storia degli scavi di Roma* III, p. 169. The old street existed until the new one was built.

by lengthening the second line, thus destroying the aesthetic balance of the inscription. His overzealousness for economy he at once counterbalanced by extravagantly making a short third line. He may also have been averse to beginning the freedman's name on a line with the emperor's titles. As a result he again economized by making the next line as wide as the stone would allow, at the same time crowding his letters.

The arrangement suggested seems plausible, though I know of no certain case of two inscriptions on a base one below the other. Perhaps *C. IX. 15* and *16*, also set up to Aurelius and Verus, are thus arranged. The *Corpus* merely states that they are found on the same base.¹

An interesting thought is suggested by the place of finding of the inscriptions. On the Caelian hill, where they were found, was the palace of the Annii, in which Marcus Aurelius was born and brought up. In *Ruins and Excavations* (1897, p. 344), Lanciani puts the site of this palace in the very Villa Casali where one, at least, of our inscriptions was found, though in the *Forma* (1898, Plate 36), he tentatively places it farther east, near the Lateran. Canina² seems to have had the same site in mind. Huelsen does not attempt to give it a definite location.³ The suggestion has been made that the famous equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, now on the Capitoline, but formerly near the Lateran, came from this *domus Anniorum*.⁴ Perhaps our inscriptions, set up to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus by a freedman of the imperial household, were placed in or near this same palace. If this supposition be accepted, the place of finding of the inscriptions may help to locate the palace.

¹ *C. XI. 5629* and *5630* also may have been arranged in the same way. At any rate they belong together, and the beginning of *5630* should be restored accordingly. Both should be assigned to the year 164. The title *pontifex maximus* given to Verus in *5630*, but rarely found elsewhere, may be due to the desire of giving Verus as much honor as Aurelius on the same stone. Similarly, this same title was omitted in the inscription to Aurelius, *IX. 15*, because it could not properly be given also to Verus in the companion inscription, *16*, as Mommsen notes.

² *Indicazione topografica di Roma antica*, 1831, p. 48.

³ Jordan (Huelsen) *Topographie I. 3*, p. 245.

⁴ *Ibid.*

I now give the two mediaeval inscriptions without comment:

1. *In quodam subcolumnio Sancte Mariae ad busta Gallica in Regione Montium erant hi uersus.* Anno milleno bis .c. sestoq; deno A cristo nato paulo tunc fonte renato | Papa gregorio residente sua sede nona. A populo dictus fuerat donnus Benedictus Qui fieri fecit actenus istud opus pro quo laudemus X cuctiq;
retro istius subcolumnii erant haec. In n̄ dñi anno dominice incarnationis MCC VI m̄ VIII tempore gg pp̄ VIII pp̄ an̄ eius VIII. hoc opus Ange|lus marmorarius de triuio fecit et composuit quo Benedictus archi. pr̄ dictus ad honorem gloriose Virginis fieri fecit.

2. *In pariete Sancti Petri in carcere iuxta forum est quedam imago Sancte Martine sub qua sunt haec.* Haec ecclesia Seti Petri in carcere est unita cum | ecclesia Sancte Martine quae est fundata hic prope iuxta marfeolum seu marforium *μαρφόριον τό ποσόλον(?)*.

One thing more remains, to attempt a closer dating of the anonymous copyist in our MS. Data are furnished by the notices regarding locations of the several inscriptions.¹ No. 7 is given by Jucundus (before 1489), Pierio Valeriano (before 1558), and our MS as being in the church of S. Maria ad Busta Gallica. Ligorio says it was taken from a church despoiled ("guasta") in the pontificate of Paul III (1534-49). No doubt S. Maria ad Busta Gallica is meant. That Ligorio is for once trustworthy is borne out by the fact that Girolamo Ferrucci (1588) states that this church had disappeared long before his time.² It seems to have continued in a semi-active state for some years after its despoliation; it is still given on Bufalini's plan (1551),³ and in the catalogue of churches made for the purpose of a charitable tax (1561).⁴ The notice in the latter is interesting: *S. Maria in Portogallo app. il colosseo: il chiericato di detta chiesa.* Apparently, the inference to be drawn from this remark is that the church was not regularly used, though it still had its clergy. Ferrucci⁵ says that in the place where the church had been "vi è ancor nel muro l'immagine di santa Margarita." In a catalogue made between 1566 and 1572 appears a notice of a church of

¹Most of the facts and dates given here are taken from the *Index auctorum* of C. VI.

²Lanciani *Storia* II, p. 212.

³Armellini *Le chiese di Roma*, 1891, p. 68.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁵*Loc. cit.*

"S. Margherita—*Ruinata*," following immediately after the mention of "S. Andrea a Portogallo."¹ Armellini says that this church of S. Margherita existed till 1587, and belonged to the De Silvestris family,² about whom we shall have more to say presently.

Metellus (probably before 1555) and Smetius (before 1551) found the inscription in the house of Eurialus Rufinus. From Ligorio's statement we can assign the copyist of our inscriptions to a date before 1549, the last year of the pontificate of Paul III, for the copyist still found the inscriptions in the church of S. Maria.

No. 5 is placed in the same church of S. Maria ad Busta Gallica by Jucundus, Metellus and our MS. Smetius places it in the house of Eurialus Rufinus. It seems as if Metellus must have copied No. 7 before the spoliation of the church, and No. 5 afterward. This hypothesis receives support if Eurialus Rufinus is the same man as Eurialus Silvestri or Firmanus (da Cingoli) mentioned in Lanciani's *Storia* II, p. 210, and III, p. 193, for in 1547 Silvestri received from the city grants of grounds close to the church. Perhaps it was then that he gained possession of the church, and removed the inscriptions.

No. 6 was in the same church in the time of Jucundus, Valeriano (before 1521), Bembo (1536) and our MS. Smetius places it in the house of Eurialus.

No. 2 was in S. Maria on the Aventine in the time of Jucundus, Ligorio (before 1566), Sabinus (about 1520), and our MS. By the time of Achilles Statius (1560–70) it was in Trastevere. Our copyist, then, did his work before the time of Statius.

Our MS says that No. 13 was found in the vineyard of the Paluzelli. Inasmuch as this vineyard was sold to the Mattei family in 1553,³ and has been known as the Villa Mattei ever since, it seems reasonable to assume that the copyist of our inscriptions did his work before 1553, though, of course, the old name of the villa may have persisted for some time after the change of ownership. Excavations were carried on in the vine-

¹ Armellini *op. cit.*, p. 76.

³ Lanciani *Storia* III, p. 81.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 138.

yard between 1537 and 1546,¹ and it is likely that during this period our copyist found No. 13, especially since we have seen that the year 1547 is about the latest possible date for the finding of No. 7.

Summing up, then, it seems a fair assumption that our inscriptions were copied about 1530-40.

Regarding the identity of the copyist, nothing definite can be said. A clue is furnished in the statement that No. 8 was found "in *our* vineyard in the Via Merulana near the Colosseum." The earliest reference I can find to the later Villa Casali (where, as shown above, No. 8 may have been found) is in 1575, when it belonged to Adriano Martire.² I have shown in another work³ that Pope Marcellus II (1555) owned our MS. It is possible, though scarcely probable, that he himself copied the inscriptions.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹*Storia* III, p. 82.

²Lanciani *Storia* III, p. 80.

³*The Manuscripts of Catullus Cited in Statius' Edition of 1566*, Chicago, 1908, p. 7.